DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 284 202 CS 210 289

AUTHOR Gale, Steven H.
TITLE Scholarly Book Publishers and Journals in English and American Literature: A Survey.
PUB DATE [86]
NOTE 28p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Research; *English Departments; English Instruction; *Faculty Publishing; Higher Education; *Scholarly Journals; *Teacher Attitudes; *Writing for Publication
IDENTIFIERS *University Presses

ABSTRACT

Submitting scholarly manuscripts and journal articles to university presses and professional journals can result in a lengthy period of frustration for the author. One possible solution is a code of ethics and practices to which publishers subscribe, although authors would have little or no control over it, and a certain amount of self-policing already occurs in the scholarly publications field. A second possible solution is a survey of publishing scholars to identify those publishers who have the best reputations throughout the profession, based on reasonable treatment of contributors and on the quality of material published. In just such a survey, 165 English faculty from 11 English departments recently rated as the "best" in the country by an education newspaper were sent a survey regarding their publishing experiences, and a total of 19 surveys were returned from six departments. Respondents identified 34 presses, with England's Oxford University Press being mentioned most often. Respondents tended to identify presses located in their general region more frequently than elsewhere, and many included the press at their own institutions. In addition, they identified 74 specialized journals and 32 general journals, with the PMLA journal mentioned most often in both categories. (Tables of results and a copy of the survey are included.) (HTH)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

# Scholarly Book Publishers and Journals in English and American Literature: A Survey

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Steven H. Gale
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED284202

by

Steven H. Gale

Almost everyone who has engaged in scholarly publication has a horror story to tell, though the tales may not all be as upsetting as that related in Kingsley Amis's Lucky Jim. Many of the horrors recounted are merely the result of happenstance--bad timing or bad luck. Unfortunately, though, there are far too many instances when a scholarly author's tale of woe derives from incompetence on the part of a university press's or journal's editorial board. It is important that this situation be addressed because the consequences are so vital, affecting the transmittal of scholarlly information and potentially having profound affects on the professional career of individual scholars as well. The following, then, is offered not as an exercise in self-pity but rather as evidence that has led me to an observation on the current state of scholarly publishing.

As an example of happenstance, I recall a colleague of mine when I was at the University of Florida whose book on Shakespeare was accepted by an established university press. Two years after the study was accepted the press was closed down and the book was returned in the same state that it had been in when it was accepted. It took the author two more years to find another publisher (happily, the book was well reviewed). Over the sixteen years that my scholarly writing has been published, I have had similar frustrating experiences. My first book was accepted for publication by a reputable university press and I was promised that it would appear within



CS 210 289

eighteen months of acceptance and assured that the time would probably be closer to one year. That was in October, 1972. The book appeared in July, 1978, and then only after some major problems with the copy editor. Even more important, the book was on Harold Pinter. At the time that I wrote the critical examination, Pinter was still a relatively new figure in contemporary British drama and only two book-length studies had been published on his work. By the time my volume was brought out, several more books had been published and many of the things that I said that were original when I wrote them seemed at first glance to be drawn from other sources. There was still enough new material included that the book was well received, but it was not the ground breaker that it should have been.

As recently as last year a university press verbally accepted a book that I had written on S.J. Perelman and then returned it some four months later with a short note explaining that they had decided not to publish the work because they felt that the market was too limited. Luckily, another publishing house accepted the book, but the manuscript was effectively out of circulation for nearly a year while the first press's editors went through the review process and then changed their minds. Perelman died in 1979 and he has thus written nothing that requires revising the manuscript and there has been very little additional critical commentary that I have had to deal with since the book was first accepted so the results of the delay are not as damaging as was the case with my first Pinter book. However, notwithstanding the economic realities that some editors invoke as an excuse, the procedures involved in dealing with university presses (single submission being the rule and an extensive length of time required to find reviewers, who then usually spend a great deal of time in examining the

text) lend themselves to potential abuses and calamity. A healthy sign that some editors are as eager to solve these problems as authors are is the increasing acceptance of multiple submissions. The concept that a few editors are adopting of issuing contracts on the basis of proposals rather than completed manuscripts, at least in the case of established writers, is another promising move, for if there is no market for a book an author prefers to know this before investing a considerable amount of time in research and writing. At the 1985 Modern Language Association Convention in Chicago an editor from a university press informed me that some members of his editorial board were not likely to accept books that unless they were written by faculty at major research institutions. It would be nice for authors who are not already well-established authorities in their field to know this before submitting a manuscript, in part because such an attitude suggests closed minds that are unable to consider new ideas or approaches and are interested only in propagating the accepted and the conventional.

Scholarly journal publishing involves many of the same problems found in scholarly book publishing. If I submit an article for consideration and do not hear from the journal editor that he has received my essay within three months, I send a query to make sure that it arrived or that his reply was not lost in the mail. If I do not hear within another three months, I send another followup letter. At the end of a year, if I still have not heard anything, I send a letter requesting that the article be returned to me and informing the editor that I will be submitting the piece elsewhere. This practice seems to me to be more than tolerant and reasonable. In three cases, though, it did not work as I had expected. One article was finally returned to me with a rejection notice one year after it had appeared in

print in another journal. On one occasion I found that a journal had published my article when I came across a reference to it in the annual MLA Bibliography, and on another occasion I found out that my work had been published when I received a complimentary copy of the journal--in both of these instances my discovery came a year after I had sent my letter of withdrawal.

Three further incidents related to scholarly journal publishing should suffice to inform editors as to why authors grow frustrated and are beginning to look for more efficient ways of approaching the need or desire to publish. A major scholarly journal returned an article of mine some years ago with a copy of the referee's report. The referee rejected the article to a large extent because he was offended by my use of language, even though the language was direct quotes from the material that I was explicating and clearly labeled such in my text, in context as well as through the use of footnotes. The referee, who signed his name to his report, is a highly respected literary critic. Then, there was the time that a journal accepted an article that I had submitted for a special issue. Six months later the manuscript was returned to me with a retyped first page and a note appended that explained that the editorial board had changed the focus of the special issue, that my essay no longer fit their subject, and that the first page had been retyped because the manuscript had been sent to the printer before the decision to change had been made and he had already marked that page for typesetting. (It is disconcerting that several important journals, including PMLA, make it a regular practice to mark an identification number in ink on the first page of a manuscript under consideration--which means that, if the manuscript is not accepted, that first page must be retyped before

the manuscript can be submitted elsewhere.) And, finally, I will never forget the astonishment and outrage that I felt when I received the offprint of an article and discovered that the editor had drastically revised it, cutting out a vital segment of my argument without ever asking my permission to do so or even telling me that he had done so. When I wrote to him about this, he replied that he felt that my statements on a specific political circumstance in a foreign country that were central to my conclusions needed independent verification, something that I could have easily provided for him had he but asked. From discussing these events with other scholars around the nation, I know that many have similar tales to tell.

Given this situation, what can be done to rectify it? Two possible remedies have occurred to me. First, there needs to be a code of ethics and practices established for publishers, whether of books or journals, and authors should know which publishers subscribe to such a code (and perhaps how well they adhere to it). The problem with this answer is that authors have little control or say in the matter. A certain amount of self-policing is already being done, of course, and authors might be invited to be members of a review board, but ultimately a lot of time could be consumed with little of a positive or helpful nature being accomplished. As the co-editor of a fledgeling journal (The Harold Pinter Review), I am cognizant of both sides of the problem, which is doubly frustrating because I realize how easily some of the events that I enumerated above could have been avoided. The Association of American University Presses has issued some guidelines for its membership, as has the Conference of Editors of Learned Journals (Guidelines for Journal Editors and Contributors, published by the MLA), yet editors seem either to be unaware of these guidelines or they have chosen to ignore them. In a conversation at the

CELJ booth at the 1986 MLA Convention in New York, the society's representative volunteered that the published guidelines were unsatisfactory.

Second, I concluded that it might be that a survey of publishing scholars could identify those publishers who have the best reputations throughout the profession, reputations based on reasonable treatment of contributors and on the quality of the material published. Besides allowing for the avoidance of potentially traumatic experiences with publishers, identifying those with the best reputations would be valuable as an aid in helping authors determine where it would be most advantageous to submit their work.

This second possibility appealed to me for two resons: It would provide solid information; it would provide that information in a short period of time. As the author of the annual Association of Departments of English salary survey, I felt that this was a reasonable set of expectations. The response rate for the 1983-84 survey, for instance, was a strong 79.25% (84 out of 106), and I hoped that this reflected a willingness within the discipline to participate in surveys relevant to our professional lives. Accordingly, I designed a survey instrument, distributed it, and collected the results, which are described below.

Procedures

For my data base I selected the English departments rated as the top eleven departments in America in a survey published as a "Fact File" item in the Chronicle of Higher Education ("How Professors Rated Faculty in 19 Fields," by Everett Carll Ladd and Seymour Martin Lipset, January 15, 1979, p. 6). This choice was at least partly based on the presumption that members of departments of this caliber both would be interested in publishing and would have extensive experience in the area, perhaps more so

than any other single group of departments randomly selected or otherwise chosen. (A widening of this base by the means of a random sampling of institutions did not seem worthwhile, as the majority of American college instructors are not actively engaged in publishing and, therefore, would have less experience to draw upon--ironically, it is this group of scholars who might need the kind of information that I was seeking because it would not be readily available to them through their colleagues at their home institutions. Recent studies quoted in The Chronicle of Higher Education estimate that one-third of all college professors never publish a single article and that approximately 5% of all college professors are responsible for 93-95% of all publications by college professors). The Ladd/Lipset survey had asked for a listing of the top five departments in the country. Those listed, in rank order, were: Yale University, Harvard University, the University of California at Berkeley, the University of Chicago, Princeton University, Stanford University, the University of Virginia, Johns Hopkins University, Columbia University, and the University of Michigan and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (tied). While rankings may vary slighty over the years, this was the most recently conducted survey available to me, and over the years these same institutions consistently have been highly regarded in a number of other surveys as well (see, for example, the Roose-Anderson ACE Rating of Graduate Departments, 1970, and An Assessment of Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States: Humanities, edited by Lyle V. Jones, Garner Lindzey, and Porter Coggeshall, National Academic Press, 1982), so I felt that the selection was sufficient and otherwise valid for my purposes.

On April 15, 1985, I sent packets addressed by name to the chairs of each of these departments. The packets contained a cover letter explaining that I was conducting a survey to determine the relative reputations of

scholarly book publishers and journals and a request that the department head distribute the survey instrument and instructions to ten full professors, three associate professors, and two assistant professors. The chairperson was invited to fill out one of the survey forms if he was interested in doing so (all of the department heads were male). The distribution over the ranks was an attempt to cover a wide range of experiences and at the same time ensure that those scholars with the most experience in publishing would be well represented, and I hoped that the numbers involved (165 questionnaires) would be sufficient to elicit a statistically viable response.

The letter of explanation that was included with each survey form read this way:

> Dear Professor:
>
> I am conducting a survey to determine the relative reputations of scholarly book publishers and journals, and I would appreciate it if you would fill in the enclosed form and return it to me as soon as possible.
>
> I am asking you to rank publishers, journals in your area of expertise, and general scholarly journals. The criteria for ranking is yours--the prestige of the press or journal, its importance, the reputations of the contributors, and any other factors that you feel are pertinent may be used in our consideration.
>
> You will not be identified on the survey form, except by area of expertise. Although your institution will be identified, the returns from your institution

will be kept confidential. I will provide your department head with a copy of the overall results to share with you.

If you have any questions about this survey, please feel free to contact me. In the meantime, thank you for your help and interest.

The forms themselves were one page long, simple, and straightforward. They included three questions, instructions for answering the questions, a due date for their return, and my name and address:

Survey: Scholarly Book Publishers and Journals
in English and American Literature

Institution:_____
Your rank:_____
Area of expertise:_____

1. Please list in order the scholarly book publishers whom you would most like to have publish your work (no minimum number; use back of form if more room needed);

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. | 6. |
| 2. | 7. |
| 3. | 8. |
| 4. | 9. |
| 5. | 10. |

2. Please list in order the scholarly journals in your area of expertise in which you would most like to have your work appear (no minimum number; use back of form is more room is needed);

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. | 6. |
| 2. | 7. |
| 3. | 8. |
| 4. | 9. |
| 5. | 10. |

3. Please list in order the general, non-specialized scholarly journal in which you would most like to have your work appear (no minimum; use back of form if more room is needed);

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. | 6. |
| 2. | 7. |
| 3. | 8. |
| 4. | 9. |
| 5. | 10. |

Please return the form as soon as possible, and no later than March 15, 1985 to:

Rather than follow the approach used by Michael West in his "Evaluating Periodicals in English Studies: Tell It in Gath if Ye Must, Young Men, but Publish It Not in Askelon" (College English, 41, 8 [April, 1980]: 903-23) and evaluate book publishers and journals myself, I decided to utilize as comprehensive a pool of expert analysis as possible by taking advantage of the experiences of other scholars. Thus, when asked with whom or where one would most like to have one's work published, respondents were encouraged to provide answers based on personal publishing experiences, their evaluations of materials that they had used, and the reputations of presses and journals that have grown through years of exposure in the academic marketplace. The due date allowed for the forms to be distributed, completed, and returned (one week each way in the mail and two weeks for filling in). An envelope with my address on it was attached to each form to make return as easy as possible.

Results

A total of nineteen completed survey forms were returned to me, a disappointing 11.52%. Of the eleven institutions surveyed, responses were received from six (54.55%), with one response that did not include identification of the institution or the responder's rank or area of specialization, though from the postmark and internal evidence I would guess that the return came from the University of California at Berkeley.

| Departments Responding | Number of Responses |
|---|---|
| University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill | 7 |
| University of Michigan | 5 |
| Columbia University | 3 |

| | |
|---|---|
| University of Virginia | 2 |
| Yale University | 1 |
| Unidentified | 1 |

Two of the respondents identified themselves as department heads. No responses were received from Harvard University, the University of California at Berkeley, the University of Chicago, Princeton University, Stanford University, or Johns Hopkins University.

Respondent's Rank

| Professor | Associate Professor | Assistant Professor |
|---|---|---|
| 12 | 4 | 2 |

The percentage of professors responding (66.67%) correlated exactly with the percentage of professors asked to participate, the percentage of associate professors responding (22.22%) was slightly higher than those invited to participate (20%), and the percentage of assistant professors (11.11%) was slightly lower (13.33%).

Self-Identified Areas of Expertise

| Area | Number of Respondents |
|---|---|
| Medieval | 2 |
| Old English | 1 |
| Renaissance | 3 |
| 17th Century | 1 |
| Romantic | 1 |
| 19th Century | 3 1/2 |
| Victorian | 2 |

| | |
|---|---|
| 20th Century | 1 1/2 |
| American | 1 |
| Comparative Literature | 1 |
| Linguistics | 1 |

Obviously the comparative numbers of respondents in the various areas could have some bearing on both the presses and journals listed and the number of listings that individual titles might have received. (The 1/2 value recorded in the "Number of Respondents" column results from one respondent self-identifying as half 19th century and half 20th century.)

Responses to Question #1: Scholarly Presses

| Rank | Press | Number of Responses | | | | | | | | | | | | Total Listings |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| 1 | Oxford University | 3 | 6 | 1 | 13 | | 3 | 1 | | | | | | 17 |
| 2 | Princeton University | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 16 |
| 3 | Harvard University | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | | 14 |
| 4 | Yale University | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | | 1 | 2 | 1 | | | | | 13 |
| 5 | University of California | | | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | | | | | | 13 |
| 6 | University of Chicago | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | 10 |
| 7 | Cambridge University | 2 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | 9 |
| 8 | University of North Carolina | | | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | 6 |
| 9 | Johns Hopkins University | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | | | | 5 |
| 10 | Cornell University | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 2 | | | 6 |
| 11 | Clarenden Press | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| 12 | University of Toronto | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| 13 | Stanford University | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | 2 |
| 14 | University of Pennsylvania | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | 3 |
| 15 | Early English Texts Society | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | Belknap | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| | Huntington Library | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| 16 | University of Columbia | | | | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| | University of Wisconsin | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| 20 | Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | University of Michigan | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 22 | Basil Blackwell | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | W.W. Norton | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 24 | Methuen | | | | | | | | | 2 | | | | 2 |
| | MIT | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | University of Minnesota | | | | | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 2 |
| | University of Virginia | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 28 | Academic | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 |
| 29 | B (undecipherable) | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| | Routledge and Kegan Paul | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| | University of Alabama | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| 32 | University of Missouri | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| | University of Munich | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| 34 | McMaster University | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | 1 |

A total of 34 presses were identified. These have been listed in a ranked order determined by assigning numerical values to the position ranked. Oxford University Press was named on 17 of the 19 survey forms, the highest number of listings received. Sixteen presses received one mention. The number of presses listed ranged from 3 to 11, with the average being 7.42.

Interestingly, there seem to be two factors working in some of the selections. Respondents tended to identify presses located in their general region more frequently than elsewhere, and 11 of the 18 identified respondents included the press at their own institution among those listed. This does not necessarily mean that chauvinism was at work, of course, since many of the best presses obviously are located at the institutions with the best research departments. The fact that other respondents recognized the same presses in their listings demonstrates that this is probably so. This present survey was not designed to investigate that question.

Responses to Question #2: Specialized Journals

| Rank | Journal Title | Number of Responses | | | | | | | | | | | | Total Responses |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| 1 | PMLA | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | 6 |
| 2 | Studies in English Literature | | 2 | 2 | | 2 | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Victorian Studies | 2 | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | | 4 |
| 4 | ELH | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | 4 |
| 5 | Modern Philology | | 2 | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | 4 |
| 6 | Speculum | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 4 |
| 7 | ELR | | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 3 |
| 8 | Comparitive Literature | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | 3 |
| | Victorian Poetry | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | 3 |
| 10 | Nineteenth-Century Fiction | | 1 | | 2 | | | | | | | | | 3 |
| | Studies in Philology | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | 3 |
| 12 | Medium Ævum | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | 3 |
| 13 | Medieval Studies | | | 2 | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 4 |
| | Traditio | | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | | 4 |
| 15 | Studies in Romanticism | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| 16 | Victorian Fiction | | | | 2 | | 1 | | | | | | | 3 |
| 17 | JEGP | | | | 2 | | | | | | 2 | | | 4 |
| 18 | Renaissance Quarterly | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| 19 | Anglo-Saxon English | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | | 2 |
| 20 | Paideuma | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | 2 |
| 21 | Victorian Newsletter | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | 2 |
| 22 | Chaucer Review | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | 2 |
| | Mediaevalie et Humanista | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | 2 |
| 24 | Angelia | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | Dickins Studies | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | Language | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | Shakespeare Quarterly | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | Yeats: An Annual of Critical and Textual Studies | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 29 | American Literature | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | Browning Institute Journal | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | Critical Inquiry | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | James Joyce Quarterly | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | Journal of Linguistics | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | Keats-Shelly Journal | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 35 | Eighteenth-Century Studies | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | Language and Society | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | New England Quarterly | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | New Literary History | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | Nineteenth-Century Poetry | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | Notes and Queries | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | University of Toronto Quarterly | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 42 | Arthurian Literature | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | English World Wide | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | Eighteenth-Century Fiction | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | Shakespeare Studies | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | Studies in the Age of Chaucer | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | Yeats Annual | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 48 | American Speech | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | Comparative Literature Studies | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | Novel | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | Philological Quarterly | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | Shakespeare Survey | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | Studies in the Novel | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | Wordsworth Circle | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 54 | John Donne Journal | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 |
| | Journal of English Linguistics | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 |
| | Modern Language Review | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 |
| 58 | Criticism | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | 1 |
| | English Studies | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | 1 |
| | Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | 1 |
| | Journal of Modern Literature | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | 1 |
| | Language Problems and Language Planning | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | 1 |
| | Modern Language Quarterly | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | 1 |
| | Studies in Browning and His Circle | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | 1 |
| 65 | Diacritics | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| | Essays in Criticism | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| | Missouri Review | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| | Neuphilologishe Mitteilungen | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| | Style | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| 70 | Acta Neophilologica/American Notes and Queries (?) | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| | Language and Style | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| | Review of English Studies | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| | Romance Philology | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| | Romanticism Past and Present | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 |

A total of 74 specialized journals were identified on the 19 forms. Two of the journals were listed by 6 respondents, and 57 journals received 1 mention. The number of journals listed ranged from 2 to 12, with 6.74 being the average.

Response to Question #3: General Journals

| Rank | Journal Title | Number of Responses | | | | | | | | | | | | Total Responses |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| 1 | PMLA | 3 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | 5 |
| 2 | Critical Inquiry | 2 | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | 4 |
| | ELH | 1 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 3 |
| 4 | Americal Scholar | 1 | | 2 | | 1 | | | | | | | | 3 |
| 5 | Modern Philology | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | 4 |
| 6 | New York Review of books | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 |
| 7 | JEGP | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | 3 |
| 8 | Studies in English Literature | | 1 | | | 2 | | | | | | | | 3 |
| 9 | Southern Review | | | | 2 | | 1 | | | | | | | 3 |
| | Yale Review | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | 3 |
| 11 | Virginia Quarterly Review | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | 3 |
| 12 | Anglia | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 3 |
| | Studies in Philology | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| 14 | Atlantic | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| 15 | Daedalus | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| | Review of English Studies | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | 2 |
| 17 | Times Literary Supplement | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | 2 |
| 18 | Raritan | | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| 19 | MLR | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | 2 |
| 20 | University of Toronto Quarterly | | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | | | 2 |
| 21 | Representations | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | 2 |
| | Bringham Young University Studies | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| | English Today | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Virgina Quaterly Review | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | 3 |
| 24 | New Literary History | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | Smithsonian Magazine | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 26 | Criticism | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 27 | English Studies | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | Harper's | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 29 | English Studien | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | Hudson Review | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 31 | Philological Quarterly | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 |
| 32 | Partisan Review | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | 1 |

A total of 32 general journals were identified. One title appeared on 5 forms, and 12 journals received 1 mention.

One interesting result is that several journals were listed on both the specialized journals list and the general journals list.

Conclusions

Two problems developed in this survey. The first and most obvious problem has to do with the number of responses received. Survey reports are traditionally based on results from a surprisingly low number of responses (the 20-30% range is the average--the ADE Salary Survey is a notable exception). However, I certainly anticipated a larger degree of participation than resulted in this instance. I felt that the questions were simple, dealt with professional concerns, and could be answered in a minimal amount of time. If I could have stated specifically where this survey would appear, perhaps the results would have been better. Perhaps I needed to offer some sort of incentive, something that I could not do. One department head informed me that he would distribute the forms, but that he was not sanguine that many of his faculty would be interested in filling them out because they could not see any benefit in doing so--"too much work for no reward," he reported. Indeed, some faculty apparently were offended at having been asked to participate. This may be a human attitude, but it is not a very professional one. In a field where the sharing of knowledge is central to our work, it would be hoped that colleagues would be willing to help in others' projects. The ramifications from the attitude demonstrated in this incident does not bode well for our discipline for if people are unwilling to share knowledge, nothing can be learned and nothing can be improved. If professors are too wrapped up in their own concerns to

contribute to an investigation of scholarly presses and journals, then they are assuredly short-sighted and unplugging their own word processors in the long run.

The second, less disturbing, problem has to do with the definitions used by the respondents in filling out their forms. For instance, I would consider Novel a specialized journal, one in an "area of expertise." PMLA would fall into the "general, non-specialized journal" category since it publishes articles on all literatures, genres, and time periods. I expected that a certain amount of cross-indexing would occur, for some journals are not easily segregated by clean topical lines, and some journals are important in diverse fields. It would not have surprised me to find PMLA at the top of the general list, then, but it did surprise me to find it at the top of both lists.

As mentioned above, because of the number of responses, locale and area of specialization may have had a more dramatic effect on the results than they warrant. Not all areas were even included (none of the journals listed, for example, deals with drama or film), and there are an inordinate number of titles that are included on only a single form. Undoubtedly this would have been offset by a larger number of respondents. I had hoped, in fact, to be able to develop sublists for this report that would have shown journals ranked within the individual fields of specialization (i.e., Victorian Literature: Victorian Studies, Victorian Poetry, Victorian Fiction, Dickens Studies, and so forth).

Despite these problems, I believe that the survey accomplished what it was intended to and therefore is valuable for those seeking information about the comparative reputations of scholarly presses and journals. There

is a remarkable consistency among the respondents, particularly in rating the book publishers, and there is a definite distinction between those presses that are considered to be a cut above the others and the field. This is also true to some extent about the best of the journals--PMLA is listed by 11 respondents, SEL by 9, and ELH by 8.

It should not be assumed, especially in the case of the journals, that exclusion of a title means that it is not among the better journals. At the same time, the presence of a title on the list, particularly those nominated by only one respondent, does not guarantee that it is a top-notch journal, merely that it has a champion. With these caveats the lists generated may serve a legitimate purpose. They provide a guide to assist authors in determining where to submit their scholarship for publication.